

Application No. 10/737,222

**REMARKS**

In a Final Office Action dated March 7, 2006 (hereinafter the "office action"), claims 4, 5, 26 and 27 were allowed. Claims 7, 9 and 15 were objected to as being based on a rejected independent claim. In response, Applicant has rewritten dependent claims 7, 9 and 15 in independent form. Claims 26 and 27 have also been kept. All other claims have been cancelled.

In the Final Office Action, Examiner noted that Figure 1 was not annotated as prior art and that the prior art references showed the same structure as Figure 1. Applicant notes that in a side cross-sectional view of the structure, such as that shown in Figure 1, the prior art will appear identical to a side cross sectional view of some embodiment of the Applicant's invention. Figures 2 and Figure 3 show different views of Applicant's invention which Applicant respectfully submits is different from the prior art. However, if a prior art notation needs to be made with respect to Figure 1, Applicant requests that the Examiner notify the undersigned.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as amended are allowable over the cited prior art reference, and allowance is hereby respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner believes a teleconference would facilitate prosecution, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Kent Chen  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 39,630  
(310) 333-3663  
June 7, 2006